

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22, 23 and 25 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22, 23 and 25 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 9, 10, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these claim amendments can be found, at least, in ¶¶ [0019], [0031] of the originally-filed Application.

Claim 25 has been cancelled.

Unless otherwise specified in the below discussion, Applicants have amended the above-referenced claims in order to provide clarity or to correct informalities in the claims. Applicants further submit that, unless discussed below, these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. By these amendments, Applicants do not concede that the cited art is prior to any invention now or previously claimed. Applicants further reserve the right to pursue the original versions of the claims in the future, for example, in a continuing application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 22-23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,346,843 issued to Hind et al. ("Hind"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128618 listing Datta et al. as inventors ("Datta") and U.S. Patent 7,168,045 issued to Fliess et al. ("Fliess"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order for a claim to be rendered invalid under 35 U.S.C. §103, the subject matter of the claim as a whole would have to be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *See* 35 U.S.C. §103(a). This requires: (1) the reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine references either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of the art; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *See* MPEP 2143; MPEP 2143.03; *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

The Office Action rejects independent Claims 1, 9, and 23 using substantially the same reasoning. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-7. In light of this approach by the Office Action, and without conceding to the implication that these claims are indeed substantially the same, Applicants will address the rejections using Claim 1, as amended, as representative of the rejected claims. Claim 1, as amended, states:

receiving a request to generate a display page, wherein
 the display page comprises realtime information and non-realtime
 information,
 the realtime information comprises information retrieved from a database
 and displayable without further computation, and
 the non-realtime information comprises information requiring computation
 to generate the non-realtime information prior to display;
 retrieving the realtime information to be included on the requested display page;
 if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is available,
 generating the requested display page comprising the retrieved realtime
 information and the previously cached non-realtime information;
 if a previously cached version of the non-realtime information is not available,
 generating the requested display page comprising the retrieved realtime
 information and an indication that the non-realtime information is
 not yet ready for display, wherein the indication that the non-
 realtime information is not yet ready for display is provided in a
 location in which the non-realtime information is to be displayed,
 requesting generation of the non-realtime information,
 caching the generated non-realtime information, and

generating the requested display page comprising the retrieved realtime information and the cached non-realtime information in response to a subsequent request for the requested display page; and
drilling down to view underlying information used to generate a selected portion of the display page, in response to a request selecting the selected portion of the display page, wherein said drilling down comprises
retrieving the underlying information used to generate the selected portion of the display page, and
presenting the underlying information by virtue of one of
regenerating the display page comprising the realtime information, the non-realtime information, and the underlying information, and
generating a new display page comprising the underlying information.

The Office Action relies on Hind, Datta, and Fliess, in combination, to reject Claim 1. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-5. But, Applicants respectfully submit that Hind, Datta, and Fliess, alone or in combination, fail to show, teach or even suggest the limitations of Claim 1, as amended.

Amended Claim 1 recites a drill down operation that is representative of previously presented Claim 25. In rejecting Claim 25, the Office Action relies on the cited sections of Fliess to disclose a drill down operation. *See* Office Action, p. 7. But, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest the drill down operation of amended Claim 1.

The cited sections of Fliess purportedly provide that a user can drill down into additional details of a business area or project as desired. *See* Fliess, 9:5-7. The Office Action equates Fliess's drill down operation with that of Claim 1. *See* Office Action, p. 7. But the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest that a drill down operation is performed to view underlying information used to generate a selected portion of a display page, in response to a request selecting the selected portion of the display

page. Instead, the cited sections of Fliess provide a drill down operation for purportedly viewing additional details concerning a selected business area or a corresponding project. *See Fliess*, 8:66-9:5. For example, these additional details can provide a list of projects falling under a particular business area and can provide project information such as project description, project manager, and location information. *See Fliess*, 9:10-23. But, Fliess's additional details for a business area or project are not comparable to the claimed underlying information, which is used to generate a portion of a display page. Therefore, Fliess's drill down operation cannot be said to teach or suggest a drill down operation that is performed to view underlying information used to generate a selected portion of a display page, as claimed.

Furthermore, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest that a drill down operation further comprises a retrieving and a presenting operation, as claimed. Amended Claim 1 discloses that a retrieving operation retrieves underlying information used to generate a selected portion of a display page and that a presenting operation presents the underlying information by either regenerating the display page or generating a new display page. By contrast, the cited sections of Fliess purportedly provide that the X dimension of a chart can be changed by selecting alternatives from a drop down box. *See Fliess*, 8:50-51. The Office Action equates Fliess's act of changing a chart dimension with the claimed retrieving information used to generate a portion of a display page. *See Office Action*, p. 7. But, changing a chart dimension via a user selection from a drop down box does not teach or suggest a retrieving operation, particularly not a retrieving operation for retrieving underlying information used to generate a selected portion of a display page.

Moreover, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest presenting underlying information by virtue of one of regenerating a display page comprising realtime, non-realtime, and underlying information and generating a new display page comprising the underlying information. The cited sections of Fliess purportedly provide that a change in one dimension of a chart results in repositioning of the existing graphic object. *See* Fliess, 8:50-60. The Office Action equates Fliess's repositioning of a graphic object to reflect a dimension change with the claimed regenerating of a display page comprising realtime, non-realtime, and selected information in response to a request related to such information. *See* Office Action, p. 7. But, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest a presenting operation, as claimed.

The claimed underlying information can be presented by virtue of a regenerating operation for regenerating a display page comprising the realtime, non-realtime, and underlying information. Thus, Claim 1 provides for a regenerated display page that comprises all three types of information as part of the same display page. By contrast, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest this limitation. This is because a chart dimension change in Fliess simply results in a repositioning of a graphic object (i.e., a new chart) to reflect the dimension data selected by the user. *See* Fliess, 8:50-60. Thus, there is no indication in Fliess that the actual underlying information used to create the new graphic object is presented as part of the same display page.

The same is also true for the additional details provided as part of a drill down operation. As seen in Fig. 8, Fliess provides that the selection of a project purportedly provides a section for displaying additional details regarding the selected project. *See*

Fig. 8 (noting that the selection of twisty icon 810 produce additional details section 820). Even if the updated view of Figure 8 can be equated to regenerating a display page (a point Applicants do not concede), the cited sections of Fliess still fail to show, teach, or even suggest that the regenerated display page comprises realtime information, non-realtime information, and underlying information. This is because the additional details provided in Figure 8 do not describe the actual information used to create a selected portion of the display page. Instead, Fliess's additional details are simply additional bits of information that provide further details regarding a project. Hence, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest the regenerating operation of Claim 1 for regenerating a display page comprising the realtime, non-realtime, and underlying information.

The claimed underlying information can also be presented by virtue of generating a new display page comprising the underlying information. The cited sections of Fliess also fail to show, teach, or even suggest this limitation. This is because the cited sections of Fliess provide for repositioning a graphic object within the same display page. *Id.* Thus, there is no indication of a new display page that comprises the underlying information used to generate a portion of the original display page.

The cited sections of Fliess further provide that additional details regarding a project can be displayed as part of a view. *See* Fliess, Fig. 8, element 820. Even if the bottom portion of Figure 8 can be equated to the claimed generation of a new display page (a point Applicants do not concede), the cited sections of Figure 8 still fail to show, teach, or even suggest that the new display page comprises underlying information. As discussed above, the additional details provided in Figure 8 are not equivalent to

underlying information because Fliess's additional details do not describe the actual information used to create a selected portion of a display page. Hence, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest the generating operation of Claim 1 for generating a new display page comprising the underlying information.

Therefore, the cited sections of Fliess fail to show, teach, or even suggest the claimed drill down operation of Claim 1. In addition, the cited sections of Hind and Datta also fail to show, teach, or even suggest the claimed drill down operation of Claim 1, as admitted by the Office Action. Moreover, such cited references have not been relied upon by the Office Action to teach these limitations.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Hind, Datta, and Fliess, alone and in combination, fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of Claims 1, 9, and 23, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5094.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Ana G. Luther

Ana G. Luther

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 61,704

Telephone: (512) 439-5094

Facsimile: (512) 439-5099